



Habitat Expansion Agreement

for

Central Valley Spring-Run Chinook Salmon and California Central Valley Steelhead

Questionnaire Instructions

The attached questionnaire is intended to solicit information needed by the Steering Committee to review projects relative to the criteria established in the Habitat Expansion Agreement. For each proposed action (project), please complete the questionnaire to the fullest extent possible. Please provide citations where applicable and provide a full reference for each citation at the end of this questionnaire (Section X. Supporting Documents). Specific instructions follow.

I. Contact Information

Provide the name of the agency or group making the proposal as well as a contact person for the project. Include contact information such as mailing address, phone number, and email address.

II. Project Description

Provide a descriptive name for the action (project). If the action is listed in the *Working List of Potential Habitat Expansion Actions* (provided during the January 2009 meetings of HEA parties), please include the reference number associated with the action. The project location should specify the watershed or subwatershed (e.g., Deer Creek, Beegum Creek) as well as specific areas within the watershed where the project will be located and what portions of the watershed will benefit from the project. Please include geographic coordinates of the project location(s), if applicable. The project description should be a narrative that provides as much detail as possible about the project.

III. Species Limiting Factors

In this section, indicate the factors that currently limit production of spring-run Chinook salmon and/or steelhead in your watershed. The intent is that the environmental and biological objectives of your project address these limiting factors in some way. Please check one or more of the limiting factors that apply to your watershed. In the second column, describe how and where the factor limits spring-run Chinook salmon and/or steelhead. For each factor that you check, please rank its effect on spring-run Chinook salmon and/or steelhead using the drop-down box in the last column. Finally, we also ask that you describe the source of your conclusions, such as a watershed assessment or other document. Please provide enough information that we can find the document if we need it.

IV. Project Objectives—Environmental

Environmental objectives describe how the project is intended to address the limiting factors to achieve the biological objective described in the next section. Environmental objectives should be as specific and quantitative as possible (e.g., reduce gravel embeddedness in the watershed from 75% to 25% by fencing riparian areas to exclude cattle and allow riparian forest to reestablish). Describe how you think environmental objectives relate specifically to the biological objectives. In the last column, we ask you to describe the environmental objectives as either the primary or secondary focus of the project. For example, a project to plant trees might have a primary focus on riparian/floodplain function with a secondary focus on temperature or water quality.

V. Project Objectives—Biological

Biological objectives describe the anticipated biological response from the project and should be as quantitative as possible. Indicate which species and life stages are the focus of the project. Describe specifically the general condition of the target species in your watershed relative to the historical abundance. The condition of the species should be indicated using the categories in the drop-down box. Species condition categories are defined on the last page of this form. Biological objectives should include the following information: (1) an estimate of the expected contribution of the project in terms of potential adult returns, to the extent possible (and an explanation of how the estimate was developed); and (2) an explanation of how the biological objective for the species is addressed by the action relative to the environmental limiting factors (e.g., the biological objective of an action might be to increase egg incubation survival in a watershed that is currently limited by sediment levels).

VI. Project Cost

To the extent possible, estimate the capital cost of the project, the annual operating and maintenance (O&M) cost, a description of annual O&M activities, and the project lifetime (i.e., how many years O&M activities are expected, including indefinitely, and how long until you expect the project to provide benefits). Provide any confirmed or potential funding partners, or opportunities for cost sharing with other funders or between projects. Also, identify any confirmed or potential partners that might provide maintenance support for the project (funding support or labor support).

VII. Schedule

Describe the project schedule, including a potential start date, construction period, and environmental and biological response times (i.e., the expected time to realize environmental and biological benefits). The last points refer to the maturation period for the project during which time environmental conditions develop. For example, it may take 50–100 years before full environmental benefits (e.g., shading, channel stability, water quality) of planting riparian trees are realized.

VIII. Feasibility

Describe the feasibility and challenges of the project. Feasibility issues should include primarily technical issues, success of projects utilizing similar technology, and particular challenges posed by the specific project. Other issues of feasibility that may be included are challenges associated with property ownership, permitting, zoning, and other social-economic-legal issues.

IX. Project Support

Describe the support or potential conflicts associated with the project. Specifically, provide supporting and cooperating entities (e.g., agencies, non-governmental organizations). Are there cooperating agencies or groups, aside from the potential funding partners mentioned previously? Describe the degree of local support and any known opposition or conflicts with other parties.

X. Supporting Documents

Provide full references for each citation used to support the information presented in this questionnaire for your project. At a minimum, a reference should include the author(s) name; name of agency/organization (if applicable); title of the document; volume and title of journal, if the document is taken from a professional journal; and publisher, date, and location of publication.



Information on Potential Projects to Support Spring-Run Chinook Salmon and Steelhead in the Sacramento River Basin for the Habitat Expansion Agreement

DUE: Friday, February 27, 2009

Send completed questionnaires to hea@water.ca.gov

I. Contact Information

Name: Mike Healey

Organization: DFG

Address: 1701 Nimbus Road, Suite A

City, State, Zip Code: Rancho Cordova, CA 95670

Phone Number: (916) 358-4334

Email Address: mhealey@dfg.ca.gov

II. Project Description

Project Name: Modification of the Fish Ladders at Daguerre Point Dam

Reference No. or New: NS-62

Project Location: Yuba River (Daguerre Point Dam Coordinates: 39°12'30"N 121°26'38"W)

Project Description:

Much evaluation and analysis has already been completed, but a final preferred althernative needs to be selected that provides full fish passage at Daguerre Point Dam. This project may involve completely redesigning and rebuilding both ladders at Daguerre Point dam to improve passage conditions for Chinook salmon and steelhead. Typically, salmon and steelhead use the north ladder substantially more than the south ladder. At present, the relative contribution of flows through the ladders (maximum 6 cfs per ladder) is minimal when compared to the sheet flow over the dam (500+ cfs), which suggests a complete redesign is needed to address the problem rather than the simpler solution of reconfiguring the base of the south ladder. Note that NGOs still want the complete removal of

II. Project Description		
Daguerre Point Dam to be considered as an option.		
III. Species Limiting Factors		
In this section, describe the limiting factors for spring-run Chinook salm watershed. The last page of this questionnaire defines the limiting factor		
Limiting Factors Description (from back page)	<u>Rank</u>	
☐ Channel Form	Select Rank	
☐ Channel Unit Types	Select Rank	
☐ Substrate	Select Rank	
☐ Structure	Select Rank	
☐ Flow	Select Rank	
☐ Temperature	Select Rank	
☐ Water Quality	Select Rank	
Partial barrier; causes delayed passage.	Medium	
☐ Riparian/Floodplain	Select Rank	
Source Documents:		
NMFS (2002) Biological opinion assessing the effects of Englebright Dam and Daguerre Point Dam on threatened Central Valley spring-run Chinook salmon and threatened Central Valley steelhead. Available http://swr.nmfs.noaa.gov/sac/myweb8/BiOpFiles/2002/Englebright_Daguerre_0327.pdf		
Entrix (June 2005). Daguerre Point Dam Fish Passage Improvement Project cd.		
Additional Notes:		
This project should be completed in conjunction with NS-63 to NS-65, which likely would increase its contribution to the HEA threshold.		
IV. Project Objectives—Environmental		
In this section, describe how your project will affect <u>one or more</u> of the l Chinook salmon or steelhead described above.	limiting factors for spring-run	
<u>Limiting Factor</u> <u>Description and Objective</u>	<u>Focus</u>	
☐ Channel Form	Select Focus	
☐ Channel Unit Types	Select Focus	
Substrate	Select Focus	

IV. Project Objec	tives—Environme	ental		
Structure			Select Focus	
☐ Flow			Select Focus	
☐ Temperature			Select Focus	
☐ Water Quality			Select Focus	
⊠ Passage		ce delays in reaching high quality holding ream of Daguerre Point Dam.	Primary	
☐ Riparian/Floodplain			Select Focus	
V. Project Object	ives—Biological			
spring-run Chinook salr		project relative to the goal of providicate the species and life stage that are ss/life stage target).		
Target Species: Spr	ring-Run Chinook Salmon	Population Status Decreasi Specific to Watershed:	ng	
Target Life Stages:				
☐ Spawning ☐ Egg Incu	bation Summer Rearing	Winter Rearing		
☐ Juvenile Emigration ☒ Adult Immigration ☐ Adult Holding				
Description of Project O	bjectives:			
Increase upstream passage and decrease delays past Daguerre Point Dam to allow adults to reach upstream holding and spawning habitat with less energy expenditure.				
Target Species: Ste	elhead	Population Status Decreasi Specific to Watershed:	ng	
Target Life Stages:				
☐ Spawning ☐ Egg Incu	bation Summer Rearing	Winter Rearing		
☐ Juvenile Emigration 🗵	Adult Immigration			
Description of Project O	bjectives:			
Increase upstream passage spawning habitat with less		guerre Point Dam to allow adults to reach	upstream	
VI. Project Cost				
Capital Cost:	\$2M			
Annual Operation and Maintenance Cost:	\$20K			

VI. Project Cost

Remove debris from ladders; maintain channel upstream of Daguerre Point **Annual Operation and**

Maintenance Description: Dam so that pathway to ladders remains open

Project Lifespan: 50 years

Project Partners

(Funding):

Corps of Engineers, CVPIA

Project Partners (Maintenance):

Corps of Engineers, DFG

VII. Schedule

2012 **Proposed Start:**

Expected Time to Completion:

2014, depending on work needed

Expected Time to Realize

Environmental Benefits:

Expected Time to Realize

Biological Benefits:

2014

2014

VIII. Feasibility

Various alternatives have been evaluated, but one needs to be selected. Design **Technical Feasibility:**

plans are needed and permits will need to be obtained.

Technical Challenges: None

NS-63 to NS-65 **Related Projects:**

Ownership or Permitting

Challenges:

None

Conflicts with Cultural,

Zoning, or Other Issues:

None

IX. Project Support

Supporting Entities: DFG

Cooperating Entities: NMFS and FWS

Degree of Local Support: Unknown

Known Opposition: NGOs still want the complete removal of Daguerre Point Dam to be considered

as an option.

X. Supporting Documents
Please provide a full reference for each citation used to support the information presented in this questionnaire.

Definitions of Limiting Factors for Spring-Run Chinook Salmon and Steelhead

Channel Form

This attribute describes changes to the channel, including incision, aggradation, diking, armoring, and other modifications of the channel adversely affecting spring-run Chinook salmon and steelhead.

Channel Unit Types

Examples of geomorphic features of the channel that form habitat types for spring-run Chinook salmon and steelhead are pools, riffles, glides, and runs. This attribute describes changes in the frequency and size of such features. For example, removal of large wood may reduce the frequency of pools, presence of steps, or retention of gravel for riffles.

Substrate

This attribute describes changes in the composition of the substrate of the stream, including increase in fine sediment and lack of gravel recruitment.

Structure

This attribute describes the loss of structural elements in the stream such as large wood, boulders, undercut banks, and so on. Loss of structure results in a simplification of the channel and influences Channel Form and Channel Unit Types.

Flow

This attribute addresses modification of the flow regime, including decrease in summer low flow, increased "flashiness," and dewatering of the channel as a result of withdrawals.

Temperature

Change in water temperature can be attributable to human actions such as removal of riparian shading. This attribute describes the increase in summer water temperature and the loss of temperature refugia (springs or groundwater) as a result of human actions.

Water Quality

This attribute pertains to the input to the stream of toxins or pollutants that produce adverse impacts on spring-run Chinook salmon or steelhead. This can include chemical pollutants such as fertilizer and pesticides and nutrient sources such as cattle and feedlots.

Passage

This relates to the effect of impediments to adult or juvenile migration of spring-run Chinook salmon or steelhead, including dams, culverts, channel dewatering, and other structural and channel modifications. Please describe the location of the passage impediment and describe the extent of impediment (i.e., a complete or partial blockage to migration).

Riparian/Floodplain

This attribute describes the loss of functionality of the riparian forest/vegetation and the connection of the stream to the floodplain during high water and flooding.

Population Condition Definitions for Section V. Project Objectives—Biological

Increasing

Adult returns of the target species to the watershed have generally been increasing over the last several years; expectations are that the species is displaying characteristics of a rebuilding or healthy population.

Stable

Adult returns of the target species to the watershed show no clear trend over the last several years.

Decreasing

Adult returns of the target species to the watershed are declining over the last several years; the decline in abundance is a cause of concern and characteristic of a potentially unhealthy population.

Intermittent

Adult returns of the target species are occasionally seen in the watershed, but there is no viable or sustained population in the basin.

Extirpated

The population has been eliminated from the watershed although the species was present in the past.

Never Present

The species has never been known to occur in the watershed.